DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 054 PS 025 300

AUTHOR Gaffney, Patrick V.
TITLE Arguments in Opposition to the Use of Corporal Punishment: A Comprehensive Review of the Literature.
PUB DATE 17 Mar 97
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Urban/Multicultural Education: Past, Present, and Future (3rd, North Miami, FL, February 27-March 1, 1997).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Children; Classroom Techniques; *Corporal Punishment; *Discipline; Discipline Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; State of the Art Reviews; Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

From a comprehensive review of the professional literature, 55 arguments are drawn and presented that criticize to varying degrees corporal punishment as a proper and defensible disciplinary measure with children in the school setting. In general, such arguments are based upon philosophical, empirical, political, logical, psychological, moral, professional opinion, legal, pedagogical, sociological, physiological (medical), and theoretical grounds. Each argument may be used for personal reflection, consideration, and further exploration in the arena of public discussion regarding this recurrent, important, and controversial issue. In addition, some common definitions and conceptual parameters associated with the term corporal punishment are examined. A consensus regarding the definition is lacking, but generally corporal punishment includes purposeful and intentional administration of pain or discomfort as a penalty for offensive or improper behavior. The article includes a list of organizations with the aim of abolishing corporal punishment. Contains 120 references. (Author/KDFB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PS

Arguments In Opposition To The Use Of Corporal Punishment: A Comprehensive Review Of The Literature

ED 406 054

Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Urban/Multicultural Education: Past, Present, and Future
North Miami, Florida
(February 27 - March 1, 1997)

Patrick V. Gaffney, Ph.D. - St. Thomas University (Miami, Florida)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patrick V. Gaffney
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

March 17, 1997

PS 025300

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Arguments In Opposition To The Use Of Corporal Punishment: A Comprehensive Review Of The Literature

By Patrick V. Gaffney, Ph.D.

Following a comprehensive review of the professional literature, 55 arguments were found and are presented that criticize and call into question to varying degrees corporal punishment as a proper and defensible disciplinary measure with children primarily situated within the school setting. In general, such arguments are based upon philosophical, empirical, political, logical, psychological, moral, professional opinion, legal, pedagogical, sociological, physiological (medical), and theoretical grounds. The author is of the opinion that each of the 55 arguments is worthy of personal reflection, consideration, and further exploration by those individuals involved or wishing to become involved within the arena of public discussion regarding this recurrent, important, and controversial issue. In addition, some common definitions and conceptual parameters associated with the term corporal punishment are examined. This 40 page paper ends with some final remarks, a list of different organizations aimed at abolishing corporal punishment, and a reference section containing over 120 sources.

"Force has no place where there is need of skill." (Herodotus)

"The use of corporal punishment in a society is an indication that the society has not yet come of age as a democracy and is still suffering from the insecurities of immaturity." (Paul Nash)

"I believe that there is no longer any use for corporal punishment in schools and much to be gained by suppressing it." (B.F. Skinner)

"The infliction of pain or discomfort, however minor, is not a desirable method of communicating with children." (The American Medical Association)

"The schools are the last institution in our society in which beating is legal." (Diane Divoky)

"Corporal punishment of children should be considered a form of child abuse that is contrary to current knowledge of human behavior and sound education practices." (The American Bar Association)

"Good school discipline should be instilled through the mind, not the behind." (Robert E. Fathman)

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine in a descriptive, as opposed to an evaluative, manner various arguments advanced in opposition to the use of corporal punishment, primarily within the context of the school setting. The content of this document is the result of a comprehensive review of primarily the periodical literature on what is regarded as a most controversial issue concerning the treatment of children (Diamantes, 1992 & 1994; Forness & Sinclair, 1984; Johns & MacNaughton, 1990; McCann, 1978; Rich, 1989; Rust & Kinnard, 1983). Over 120 sources were looked at. In total, 55 arguments will be presented that criticize and call into question to varying degrees physical punishment as a proper and defensible disciplinary measure with children.

It will be noted that some of the arguments are distinctly

different from others, some arguments are part of even larger arguments, and some arguments are closely related, if not overlapping, with others. In addition, some of the arguments are commonly found in the literature, and some are quite distinct in their approach. It is important to keep in mind that no claim is being made that every existing or conceivable argument against the utilization of corporal punishment is contained within this paper, that there will be universal agreement with what this writer regards as an argument, or that there will be common acceptance that there are in reality 55 arguments to begin with. In addition, no claim is being made that every source mentioned in this document is necessarily an opponent to this form of disciplinary procedure.

So that the reader has a common understanding regarding what is meant by the term corporal or physical punishment, the present author will first begin by looking at some common definitions and conceptual parameters associated with the term. This paper ends with some final remarks, a list of different organizations aimed at abolishing physical punishment, and a reference section.

Definitions And Conceptual Parameters Of Corporal Punishment

A consensus regarding the definition of corporal punishment is lacking (Rose, 1989). As applied to the schools, this term is seen as the presentation of an aversive stimulus contingent upon some behavior (Rose, 1981), as chastisement inflicted on the body in order to modify behavior (Rich, 1989), or as the infliction of physical pain contingent upon the occurrence of misbehavior (Vockell, 1991). Such a disciplinary measure refers to any type of physical reproach that inflicts not only pain but discomfort as well in order to eradicate misbehavior (Castan, 1973; Payne, 1989). This can entail such actions as shaking, paddling, spanking, grabbing, shoving a child "roughly," choking, slapping, excessive exercise, pinching, disrobement, or confinement in an uncomfortable place (Burden & Byrd, 1994; Straus, 1991; Tauber, 1995). Corporal punishment can also include the manipulation of positive and enjoyable experiences, such as recess, free-time, or permission to attend sporting events (Diamantes, 1994) or the loss of personal freedom (Clarke, Liberman-Lascoe, & Hyman, 1982). According to Florida statute 228.041-(27) (Florida School Laws, 1995),

> Corporal punishment is the moderate use of physical force or physical contact by a teacher or principal as may be necessary to maintain discipline or to enforce school rule. However, the term "corporal punishment" does not include the use of such reasonable force by a teacher or principal as may be necessary for self-protection or to protect other students from disruptive students. (p. 4)

Although varying in detail, the different conceptualizations of physical punishment usually convey the idea of the purposeful and intentional administration of some degree of pain or discomfort as a penalty for offensive or improper behavior committed by a child. By defintion this term does not simply mean punishment as a consequence of rule infraction, but it is the premeditated policy of infliction of pain on a child, most often with a paddle (Hyman, Clarke, & Erdlen, 1987), by a teacher or a school administrator as a regular consequence for breaking a school rule (Johns & MacNaughton, 1990). According to Vockell (1991), the key terms in the definition of corporal punishment are physical pain and contingent. Regarding the latter term, the recipient of physical pain must see a cause-and-effect relationship between the administration of such pain and the event that lead up to it. In most schools, physical punishment is utilized according to guidelines that require specification of the contingency.

The term corporal punishment must be distinguished from physical restraint, which refers to procedures used to prevent or stop an attack by a child against a school official or another child (Ball, 1989; Johns & MacNaughton, 1990). In fact, physical punishment in the schools is not implied when a school official utilizes force: (1) to protect himself/herself, a child, or others from injury; (2) to prevent a child from hurting himself/herself; (3) to obtain possession of a weapon or another dangerous object; or (4) to protect property from damage (Clarke, Liberman-Lascoe, & Hyman, 1982; Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977). Even the most ardent opponents of corporal punishment tend to agree that there are situations when school officials must use force in order to save children or themselves from injury (Brenton, 1978).

Parental discipline styles may be distinguished in terms of three distinct types (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967). The explicit

induction type entails the parents' employment of reasoning, discussion, and/or roleplaying and involves focusing attention upon the consequences of a child's misbehavior without the use of punishment. The love withdrawal type signifies the utilization of the withdrawal of parents' affection as a punishment for a child's undesirable behavior. Finally, the power assertion type involves the use of physical or material sanctions to control a child's misbehavior. Both the withdrawal of privileges and the administration of corporal punishment are disciplinary procedures normally associated with this latter type.

Arguments Against The Use Of Corporal Punishment

1) Teaching is the only profession in which it is still lawful to physically punish the client (Dill & Haberman, 1995). Schools are the only public institutions in this nation legally allowed to adminster corporal punishment (Divoky, 1973; Englander, 1978; Wilson, 1982). Ironically, such forms of punishment are not allowed in either prisons, mental hospitals, or the military (Fathman, 1995; Johns & MacNaughton, 1990; Kessler, 1985; Merlis, 1975). In this regard, it is also ironic that children have fewer rights than convicted criminals (Zigler & Hunsinger, 1977) and that they would only be protected from the use of physical punishment if convicted of a crime (Hyman, 1978).

2) The use of corporal punishment in this nation's schools dates back to the colonial period (Rancifer, 1995) and its inheritance is deeply entrenched within society (Van Dyke, 1984). Thus this form of punishment is seen as an antiquated approach to discipline within the schools. Furthermore, it seems well-established in the minds of some educators that children must be "disciplined" and that hitting them to make them more disciplined is both a right and a responsibility on their part (Cryan, 1987 & 1995).

3) Moral reasons for rejecting corporal punishment exist. One must draw the line on the issue of human dignity and the worth of the individual, i.e., sanctioning the use of physical punishment in the schools only undermines this basic human tenet (Wise, 1979). Corporal punishment may readily cause a sense of humiliation which can lead to dehumanization. One's sense of dignity is damaged by such humiliation (Rich, 1989). For many children it is the demeaning

indignity involved in the use of physical punishment, rather than the pain itself, that is the salient component of this form of disciplinary action (Vockell, 1991).

4) None of the leading theories or models of behavioral management, e.g., behavior modification, Gordon's teacher effectiveness training, Glasser's deficiency model, Dreikurs's logical consequences or Canter's assertive discipline, endorse the use of corporal punishment (Rich, 1989). Thus with few exceptions, e.g., James Dobson, this particular procedure is neither suggested nor defended by any recognized authority on classroom management and discipline (Johns & MacNaughton, 1990). Moreover, nearly all specialists within the fields of mental health and child rearing tend to believe that the utilization of physical punishment represents a violation of children's rights and a debasement of the primary goals of education (Bard, 1973).

5) An important theoretical disadvantage to the use of corporal punishment is that it is not likely to be logically related to the misbehavior in question. In other words, physical punishment is likely to be a very artificial form of disciplinary action (Vockell, 1991).

6) School officials defending the use of corporal punishment often argue that it is administered as an alternative to suspension. However, there is evidence suggesting that schools that utilize physical punishment also tend to use suspension as a regular disciplinary measure (Glackman, Martin, Hyman, McDowell, Berv, & Spino, 1978; Hyman, 1978). Such evidence suggests that an organizational atmosphere of punitiveness toward children results in the frequent utilization of both of these disciplinary procedures (Hyman, 1978).

7) Corporal punishment is often administered to a degree greatly disproportionate to the nature of a child's misbehavior (Medway & Smircic, 1992; Orentlicher, 1992). There is evidence indicating that most of the offenses committed by children leading up to the use of physical punishment are nonviolent in nature, thus suggesting that the severity of the punishment has little to do with the nature of the offense (Clarke, Liberman-Lascoe, & Hyman, 1982; Hyman, Clarke, & Erdlen, 1987). Stories about the use of corporal punishment for

minor offenses abound. Once this form of discipline is institutionalized, it may well be utilized for every offense (Johns & MacNaughton, 1990). Moreover, lawsuits against educators have risen annually since 1969, and many of them involved the use of physical punishment for only minor infractions (Baker, 1987).

8) Corporal punishment is frequently used as the first resort for minor misbehaviors (Fathman, 1995). There is evidence suggesting a lack of relationship between the administration of physical punishment and both the severity and frequency of rule violations (Shaw & Braden, 1990). What is often claimed and recommended as a "last-resort" procedure, corporal punishment is actually utilized too soon and too often, therefore, undermining the search for more appropriate behavioral management alternatives (Tauber, 1995). Furthermore, such punishment administered under "last-resort" conditions carries with it feelings of desperation and frustration and thus a greater potential for causing physical harm to children (Wilson, 1982).

9) Corporal punishment becomes less appropriate as children progress through school and mature both physically and mentally (Elrod, 1983). To be truly effective, physical punishment would have to be repeated continuously and would have to become more severe as the child got older and became more accustomed to it (Johns & MacNaughton, 1990). Yet a child's age, along with his/her physical and mental health, are often not even considered by those who use this form of punishment (Clarke, Liberman-Lascoe, & Hyman, 1982).

10) Some children may actually prefer being administered corporal punishment, which tends to greatly reduce its disciplinary effect (Elrod, 1983; Nash, 1963). This appears to be supported in part by evidence indicating that the same children tend to be paddled repeatedly (Block, 1994). There is further evidence that males tend to equate receiving physical punishment with claims to manhood, group solidarity, personal belonging, and a rise in social status and standing among one's peers (Mercurio, 1972).

11) Educators tend to be inconsistent regarding their reasons for using corporal punishment (Clarke, Liberman-Lascoe, & Hyman, 1982). A major contributing factor to this situation is that many behaviors resulting in the use of physical punishment are found to

be vague and ill-defined. Examples include "disrespect for the teacher," "immature behavior," "general misconduct," "horse-play," and "inappropriate classroom behavior." Such descriptions are so lacking in both precision and definitiveness that specific behaviors fitting such descriptions may or may not be met with corporal punishment, depending on any number of possible situation-specific factors, e.g., the educator's mood, time of the day, or day of the week (Rose, 1983).

12) In school systems that prohibit the use of corporal punishment, both educators and children survive well without it (Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977). When schools have eliminated physical punishment, there has not been a corresponding increase in behavioral problems nor an eruption of anarchy (Carey, 1994; Hyman, 1978; Hyman & Lally, 1981; Maurer, 1980; Orentlicher, 1992). Moreover, data suggest that the absence of corporal punishment is not a serious threat to either school decorum or the learning climate (Farley, Kreutter, Russell, Blackwell, Finkelstein, & Hyman, 1978). Furthermore, an increasing number of school districts have discovered that the use of physical punishment adds nothing to the overall morale or efficient functioning of their schools (Maurer, 1980). Overall, the elimination of corporal punishment will be no more restricting to educators when it comes to managing children's behavior than the withdrawl of any other single disciplinary procedure (Diamantes, 1992).

13) Corporal punishment is not the educator's tool of choice for all children in all schools within all communities for demographic factors clearly exist regarding its use (Tauber, 1995). Opponents of physical punishment have voiced concerns regarding the fairness of its administration (Dayton, 1994). For instance, gender, racial, and age inequalities exist concerning the utilization of corporal punishment. This means of disciplinary action is not administered solely on the basis of a child's misconduct. Rather a child's misbehavior, race, gender, and age all assist in determining whether and to what degree physical punishment is used (Slate, Perez, Waldrop, & Justen, 1991). Thus the problems with corporal punishment are compounded by an arbitrariness in its administration, i.e., its utilization in the schools is often related to considerations that are not relevant to children's misconduct (Orentlicher, 1992). Furthermore, the inequitable use of physical punishment appears to conflict with legislative policies on

racial, economic, and gender equity and may also be actionable under the equal protection clause of the federal constitution (Dayton, 1994). The disproportionate and discriminatory administration of corporal punishment tends to occur more often with the ensuing groups of children demonstrating the following characteristics:

*Minority-group children, especially Afro-Americans and Hispanics (Clark In Clark & Miller, 1980; Clarke, Liberman-Lascoe, & Hyman, 1982; Dayton, 1994; Fathman, 1995; Hyman, 1978; Johns & MacNaughton, 1990; Maurer, 1990; Orentlicher, 1992; Radin, 1988; Rich, 1989; Shaw & Braden, 1990; Slate, Perez, Waldrop, & Justen, 1991; Waters, 1993; Welsh, 1978).

*Males, especially Afro-American males, Hispanic males, and frail or small-stature males (Ball, 1989; Boonin, 1979; Bryan & Freed, 1982; Dayton, 1994; Fathman, 1995; Gilmartin, 1979; Hyman, 1978; Hyman, Clarke, & Erdlen, 1987; Maurer, 1990; Radin, 1988; Rose, 1984; Shaw & Braden, 1990; Slate, Perez, Waldrop, & Justen, 1991; Straus, 1971; Tauber, 1995; Welsh, 1978; Zussman, 1978).

*Children in elementary school and especially junior high school settings (Ball, 1989; Boonin, 1979; Elrod, 1983; Hyman, Clarke, & Erdlen, 1987; Maurer, 1990; Slate, Perez, Waldrop, & Justen, 1991; Zigler & Hunsinger, 1977).

*Economically disadvantaged children (Clark In Clark & Miller, 1980; Dayton, 1994; Fathman, 1995; Johns & MacNaughton, 1990; Rich, 1989; Smith, Polloway, & West, 1979; Zussman, 1978).

*Children attending schools in poor, inner-city, or ghetto areas (Bauer, Dubanoski, Yamauchi, & Honbo, 1990; Johns & MacNaughton, 1990).

*Children in rural schools (Elrod, 1983; Maurer, 1990; Orentlicher, 1992; Pross, 1988; Rose, 1984).

*Children in schools with smaller enrollments (Elrod, 1983; Maurer, 1990; Orentlicher, 1992; Rose, 1984).

*Children living in smaller communities (Elrod, 1983; Orentlicher, 1992; Rose, 1984).

*Children who live in conservative Protestant communities (Deley, 1988; Ellison & Sherkat, 1993).

*Children attending schools in southern (especially former slave states), southeastern, or southwestern regions of this nation (Cohen, 1996; Flynn, 1994; Harp & Miller, 1995; Hyman, 1978; Hyman & D'Alessandro, 1984; Orentlicher, 1992; Richardson & Evans, 1994a; Richardson, Wilcox, & Dunne, 1994; Wiehe, 1990). In fact, the states of Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, Tennessee, Texas, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Kentucky accounted for 76% of all reported incidents of corporal punishment during the 1989-1990 school year (Waters, 1993).

*Children with special learning disabilities, behavioral disorders, or mental retardation (Fathman, 1995; Maurer, 1990; Orentlicher, 1992; Richardson, Wilcox, & Dunne, 1994; Rose, 1983 & 1989; Smith, Polloway, & West, 1979).

*Children with already very low self-esteem (Brenton, 1978).

*Children who are already aggressive in nature (Welsh, 1978).

*Children with inexperienced or less-experienced teachers (Kennedy, 1995; Rust & Kinnard, 1983; Tauber, 1995).

*Children who are already exposed to much higher rates of violence within their communities (Richardson & Evans, 1994a).

14) While corporal punishment may be used often because it is relatively quick and easy to administer, it may preclude seeking the underlying causes of a child's misbehavior (Elrod, 1983). In essence, physical punishment fails to deal with the problem(s) at the heart of disruptive behavior (Radin, 1988). A punitive approach serves to distract and sidetrack adults from the important and necessary task of becoming aware of and dealing with children's needs and felt deprivations (Gilmartin, 1979). Thus corporal punishment does not

achieve its stated goal of the establishment and the preservation of discipline because it is treating the symptoms, as opposed to the causes, of children's misbehavior (Keeshan, 1989).

15) The most that can be said for corporal punishment is that it usually stops misbehavior temporarily (Block, 1994). As a momentary cessation or suppression of unwanted behaviors, physical punishment fails to teach children appropriate behaviors (Richardson & Evans, 1994b; Slate, Perez, Waldrop, & Justen, 1991). Moreover, according to behavioral psychologists corporal punishment constitutes negative reinforcement. As such, it has been found to be relatively ineffective in permanently altering behavior because it must be continually repeated (Cryan & Smith, 1981).

16) A problem with corporal punishment is that it teaches the child what not to do, instead of what to do (Dubanoski, Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983). Physical punishment does nothing to teach matters like civil problem-solving approaches or ways to resolve conflicts in a positive or constructive manner (Gilmartin, 1979; Simmons, 1991). Children who consistently receive corporal punishment are less likely to be able to learn to solve problems logically (Richardson & Evans, 1994b). Moreover, an excessive reliance on physical punishment can cause educators to neglect more important strategies, such as reasoning and the use of natural consequences, that can lead to enhanced learning of self-discipline by children (Vockell, 1991). In addition, corporal punishment fails to contribute to the development of a desire to want to behave in positive ways on the part of children (Henson, 1986). Furthermore, the use of physical punishment does not appear to correct, shape, or refine the moral character of a child (Carey, 1994), and there is evidence that this form of discipline tends to produce a child who is low on both internalized moral standards and self-directedness (Straus, 1971).

17) It is usually very difficult for the recipient of corporal punishment to engage in desirable behavior in order to terminate its administration, whereas for many other forms of discipline desirable behaviors are readily available (Vockell, 1991).

18) Among all of the developed and industrialized nations of the world, corporal punishment is now prohibited in the schools, except for South Africa and areas of Canada, Australia, and the United

States. Moreover, there has been a trend toward the prohibition of physical punishment within schools worldwide starting as far back as the 18th century: Poland (1783), Italy (1860), France (1881), Russia (1917), China (1949), Sweden (1958), Germany (1970), United Kingdom (1986), and New Zealand (1990). Although the use of corporal punishment has been disappearing from this nation's schools at a steady rate since the early 1970s, when compared to certain areas of the global community the United States is still very far behind (Fathman, 1995).

19) Within recent times the administration of corporal punishment in this nation's schools has decreased considerably and steadily (Richardson & Evans, 1994b), often on the grounds that this type of punishment was not effective and too often lead to abuse (Harp & Miller, 1995). Presently, 27 states have now banned the use of physical punishment within their schools either by state law, by state regulation, or by an act of the state school board, up from only one state in the early 1970s. These states include the following: Alaska, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. In Rhode Island, corporal punishment is prohibited by every local school board within the state. Unlike Florida, Virginia remains the only southern state that has banned the use of physical punishment within its schools (Fathman, 1995).

Legal support for corporal punishment within this nation's schools has already become a minority position, since it is prohibited in many of the most populous states and even in many large urban areas within those states that currently permit physical punishment (Dayton, 1994), e.g., Miami-Dade County, Florida. Moreover, Catholic parochial schools, which may not be affected by state laws or state board of education bans on corporal punishment and which have been known for their use of this form of disciplinary measure, now forbid physical punishment in most dioceses across the country (Waters, 1993), e.g., the Archdiocese of Miami covering Broward, Dade, and Monroe counties. Furthermore, several of the Bible Belt states, where both ardent Protestant fundamentalism and corporal punishment remain strong, are moving toward the use of alternative

approaches to physical punishment, e.g., implementation of services in group conflict resolution within Arkansas schools. Such changes, along with an overall reduction in the number of reported incidents of corporal punishment from 1978 to 1990 in southern schools, are attributed to the efforts of various advocacy groups, e.g., the Florida Committee to Abolish Corporal Punishment in Schools (Richardson, Wilcox, & Dunne, 1994). This growth in the opposition toward the use of physical punishment has also arisen and continues to develop synergistically from the following sources (Hyman, 1993):

*A general societal sensitivity toward child abuse.
*The development of vocal organizations specifically devoted to the abolition of child abuse and corporal punishment, e.g., the National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse and the National Coalition to Abolish Corporal Punishment in Schools.
*The increase in the number and stature of professional organizations opposed to the use of physical punishment, e.g., the American Bar Association and the National Education Association.
*The shift of emphasis in family child rearing toward a psychological developmental approach and away from a strict parents' rights approach.
*The rise in influence of the women's movement within American life and policy making.
*The increase in the amount of books, newspaper and magazine articles, and television and radio programs advocating the elimination of corporal punishment in both schools and homes.

In addition, more enlightened child-rearing practices, clinical studies indicating that physical punishment has a negative effect upon children, and an enhanced awareness of children's rights are also perceived as contributing factors to this overall trend (Brenton, 1978). Furthermore, new and powerful alliances between the more organized child-abuse-prevention groups and the anti-corporal-punishment groups has given the latter both an organizational and psychological edge in their efforts to abolish this form of punishment (Viadero, 1988).

20) An increasing number of national organizations have called for the elimination of corporal punishment within the schools (Fathman, 1995). In fact, approximately 46 professional organizations or

associations, representing educators, physicians, attorneys and mental health specialists, have passed resolutions or adopted statements against physical punishment (Evans & Richardson, 1995). The following are examples of those organizations that have voiced opposition toward the administration of corporal punishment (Fathman, 1995):

* American Academy of Pediatrics
* American Association for Counseling and Development
* American Bar Association
* American Humanist Association
* American Medical Association
* American Psychiatric Association
* American Psychological Association
* Association of Junior Leagues
* Council for Exceptional Children
* National Association of Elementary School Principals
* National Association of School Psychologists
* National Association of Social Workers
* National Association of State Boards of Education
* National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse
* National Education Association
* National Mental Health Association

The use of physical punishment is also rejected by different religious groups, such as the Society of Friends (Quakers), Unitarian Universalists, and Presbyterians (Cryan, 1987).

21) Although there is evidence of continuing and general support for or acceptance of the use of corporal punishment among preservice educators (Diamantes, 1994; Gaffney, 1991) and school personnel (Bard, 1973; Brown & Dayne, 1988; Chase, 1975; Dubanoski, Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983; Edwards, 1997; Grasmick, Morgan, & Kennedy, 1992; Kinnard & Rust, 1981; Nash, 1963; Pallas, 1973; Pross, 1988; Raichle, 1977/1978; Richardson & Evans, 1994b; Straus, 1991), this situation may not be due to the fact that they are necessarily convinced of its validity as a disciplinary measure from sound theoretical or empirically-based points of view. Other factors may account for educators' endorsement or utilization of physical punishment with children. For instance, there is the possibility that this was the disciplinary practice followed and personally

experienced when they themselves went to school (Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977; Rust & Kinnard, 1983). Moreover, educators who continue to endorse the use of corporal punishment may do so because the larger community, out of ignorance and/or tradition, expects and approves of such behavior on their part (Ryan, 1994). Furthermore, educators may find it natural to choose physical punishment because they, like society at large, are somewhat accustomed to violence (Cryan & Smith, 1981). Finally, unawareness about the various problems associated with the administration of punishment and a lack of knowledge concerning disciplinary alternatives to corporal punishment may constitute other reasons (Dubanoski, Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983; Rust & Kinnard, 1983; Wilson, 1982).

22) It seems highly plausible that when corporal punishment is used within the schools, then parents are encouraged to utilize physical punishment at home (Straus, 1991). Many parents rely on the school system for both information and guidance regarding childrearing, and as long as schools endorse corporal punishment then parents are likely to do the same (Kennedy, 1995). This especially holds true for the poor and the unsophisticated segments of a community (Welsh, 1978). An NEA Task Force report points out that support of corporal punishment by schools encourages people outside the school system to feel that they are justified in the physical assault of children. Conversely, by abolishing physical punishment within schools the incidence of child-beating elsewhere might be reduced (Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977). In other words, the banning of corporal punishment in schools may function to cause parents to question both its value and effectiveness. While ending physical punishment in schools will not by itself necessarily change attitudes about it or reduce its implementation within the community, schools should still be expected to set a positive example for parents to follow regarding its nonuse (Flynn, 1994; Gilmartin, 1979).

23) If corporal punishment is to be abolished, those who establish school policy must be shown that those common sense beliefs that are often used to support this form of punishment are in actuality myths with frequently no basis in fact (Dubanoski, Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983). Furthermore, educators need to realize that there are many myths regarding the powers of physical punishment. An

awareness of the following myths could help deter the overuse and the misuse of this type of disciplinary action (Henson, 1986):

*Corporal punishment is time efficient.
*The effect of corporal punishment increases with its use.
*Corporal punishment attacks the problem head on.
*All students dislike corporal punishment.
*Professional teachers only use corporal punishment for the benefit of their students.
*Corporal punishment is a way of punishing only those students who misbehave.
*Corporal punishment prepares students to live in a society that punishes those who break the rules.
*Corporal punishment deters aggression.
*Some students only understand this type of communication.
*Teachers have a right to do whatever they must to maintain discipline in the classroom.

Moreover, it is also argued that due to the absence of hard data, rationales are frequently offered in support of corporal punishment. However, the following rationales usually turn out to resemble more myth than fact (Bauer, Dubanoski, Yamauchi, & Honbo, 1990):

*Corporal punishment leads to the development of character.
*Corporal punishment teaches respect.
*Corporal punishment is the only thing some children understand.
*Without corporal punishment behavioral problems increase.
*Corporal punishment is used only as a last resort.
*Corporal punishment is necessary for the protection of teachers.

Finally, some of these myths concentrate upon the effectiveness of physical punishment, while others deal with the harmlessness of such a disciplinary measure (Straus, 1994):

*Spanking works better than other methods.
*Spanking is needed as a last resort.
*Spanking is harmless: I was spanked and I'm OK.
*One or two instances are not going to cause any damage.
*Parents can't stop unless they get training in alternatives.

*If you can't spank, children will be spoiled, run wild, etc.
*Parents do it only rarely or only for serious problems.
*By the time a child is a teenager, parents have stopped.
*If parents don't spank, they will verbally abuse a child.
*It is unrealistic to expect parents never to spank.

24) Despite rulings to the contrary by the U.S. Supreme Court in Baker v. Owen (1975) and Ingraham v. Wright (1977), the following represent major constitutional arguments advanced against the use of corporal punishment within the schools: (1) Physical punishment is cruel and unusual; (2) As presently administered, corporal punishment denies procedural due process; (3) Physical punishment denies substantive due process; and (4) Corporal punishment infringes on parental rights to rear children as parents see fit (Davidson, 1980). (Note Bene: Concerning argument number (3), Dayton (1994), Orentlicher (1992), and Van Dyke (1984) state that the High Court has declined to resolve whether or not the administration of physical punishment in the schools violates the Fourteenth Amendment's right of substantive due process.)

25) A common rationale justifying the use of corporal punishment within American schools is based upon the principle of in loco parentis (in place of parents) which is derived from English common law (Francis & Hirschberger, 1973; Gordon, 1995; Wilson, 1982). This principle spells out the responsibility of educators to assume the role of parenthood in the absence of parents during the school day. This principle made sense in England back in the 18th century when wealthy landowners hired tutors to teach their young. The parents voluntarily committed the child to the authority of a tutor who usually spent the entire day with the child in a small class or school, thereby developing something similar to a parent-child relationship with the student. If the tutor performed unsatisfactory service, then the parents could readily terminate him/her.

While this principle originated and was very useful back when education was both voluntary and personal in nature, its applicability is questionable within the modern bureaucratic system of American schools which tends to distance and insulate school personnel from parents. At present education is compulsory, parents often have little or no opportunity to select either teachers or schools, most teachers instruct children for only part of the day, and

few opportunities exist for teachers to form close relationships with children within the context of large classes and schools. In addition, the school-child relationship is intermittent, i.e., different adults are involved at different times of the day and school year often at superficial levels of interaction and for short periods of time (Cryan, 1987; Cryan & Smith, 1981; Davidson, 1980; Divoky, 1973; Hyman & Lally, 1981).

26) Corporal punishment has become increasingly litigious (Johns & MacNaughton, 1990; Sendor, 1987). At times educators and school boards are sued when such punishment is administered within their schools (Fathman, 1995). Educators who use excessive or unreasonable force during the administration of physical punishment may be dismissed or be charged with unprofessional conduct by a school district, may be subject to a tort suit for assault, and/or may be subject to criminal penalties if the force is especially extreme or unnecessary (Rich, 1989). According to Vockell (1991), injuries, with resulting lawsuits, pose a real danger with the utilization of corporal punishment. As a result, many states and school systems have responded to this threat by simply banning physical punishment. However, educators must be aware that, for legitimate cause, lawsuits on the part of parents are likely to be successful even in states and school systems where corporal punishment is allowed. Moreover, having parents sign release forms that permit the use of physical punishment with their children does not necessarily relieve educator liability (Simmons, 1991). Furthermore, the emotional and professional damage resulting from the mere accusation of child abuse resulting from an administration of corporal punishment can have a devastating impact even if the school employee in question is ultimately vindicated (Simpson, 1988).

27) It is somewhat ironic that the very same act of physical punishment that is permissible for parents to use and for educators to administer in certain jurisdictions of this country would constitute criminal assault for someone not situated in a custodial relationship with a child (Straus, 1991).

28) Where unreasonable or excessive corporal punishment has been administered, state remedies available as protections for children have been of questionable adequacy. For instance, Justice Byron White, in his dissenting opinion in Ingraham v. Wright (1977),

disagreed with the viewpoint expressed in Justice Lewis Powell's majority opinion that safeguards within state law provide adequate protection for children from excessive and unwarranted use of physical punishment. He pointed out that both civil and criminal remedies emphasized in the majority's opinion can only be exercised after, not before, the administration of corporal punishment. Thus there is a need for some type of procedural due process in order to insure that questions about justification and mistaken identity can be addressed in a fair manner before the utilization of this means of discipline (Englander, 1978; Flygare, 1978). Moreover, in order for parents to prevail in a post-punishment lawsuit for damages they must show that a tort was committed against their child which is a difficult task at best (Davidson, 1980). Furthermore, although severe abuse resulting from an administration of physical punishment could lead to law suits brought forth by parents on behalf of their children, in actuality few parents will devote the time, money, and energy toward such legal remedies (Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977).

29) In the absence of a state or a local prohibition against corporal punishment, the common law permits school personnel to administer physical force that is reasonably necessary for the proper control and education of children (Orentlicher, 1992). However, determining what is reasonable creates a difficult problem for both the courts and the community (Spring, 1994). Reasonableness can become idiosyncratic as situational, individual, community, or other factors influence what constitutes the meaning of this term (Wilson, 1982). Since reasonableness frequently reflects local attitudes, its definition and determination will vary among the lower courts from region to region (Johnson, Dupuis, Musial, & Hall, 1994). Unfortunately, the judicial system has provided little guidance when determining if the use of physical punishment crosses the line from being reasonable to being excessive (Simpson, 1988).

30) The use of corporal punishment within the schools may already be unlawful in the United States because of this nation's ratification of the United Nations Charter. This unique challenge is based upon international law. Thus it is argued that such law prohibits physical punishment and was incorporated into U.S. law through this country's ratification of the United Nations Charter (Dayton, 1994).

31) The use of corporal punishment in the school system is an officially sanctioned or legalized form of institutional child abuse (Ball, 1989; Dubanoski, Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983; Maurer, 1980; Rich, 1989). Abuse may be defined as the actual infliction of bodily changes as the result of force rather than by the need for medical attention (Hyman, 1978). Opponents of physical punishment view official state support for striking children within the schools as conflicting with legislative policies regarding child abuse (Dayton, 1994). The government is regarded as not being able to provide an effective leadership role in the effort to stop the physical abuse of children when it sanctions the corporal punishment of children within its own educational institutions (Orentlicher, 1992). Furthermore, in light of the present research on the cycle of child abuse, the question arises whether the schools are contributing to a future generation of parents or educators who will someday physically abuse their children or students by allowing the practice of physical punishment to be used as a disciplinary measure (Elrod, 1983; Fathman, 1995; Orentlicher, 1992; Ramella, 1973).

32) The use of physical punishment carries the risk of serious harm to children (Maurer, 1980; Orentlicher, 1992). Injury to children seems to begin as ordinary corporal punishment which escalates into physical child abuse (Deley, 1988). In rare cases, some children's deaths have occurred as a result of the administration of physical punishment within the schools (Fathman, 1995). Because of their physical and psychological immaturity, children are especially vulnerable to the potential harm resulting from corporal punishment. They are powerless to protect themselves or to lobby for changes within the law (Orentlicher, 1992).

33) Corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure tends to become a matter of retribution. Whenever physical punishment is relied upon to enforce classroom control, it is likely to become an avenue for the educator getting revenge on the unruly child or it may become just a face-saving device (Barbour, 1944).

34) The potential for abuse of corporal punishment is enormous. Adults underestimate the amount of force that they are capable of producing (Cryan, 1995). Being human, educators can get so angry with a child that they hit too hard. There is no guarantee that the license to utilize physical punishment won't unleash a sadistic streak

in some individuals or result in excesses (Kessler, 1985). Moreover, there is also the potential that corporal punishment may be used as a release for teacher or administrator frustration rather than being a carefully thought-through disciplinary procedure (Elrod, 1983; Mercurio, 1972; Pross, 1988; Zigler & Hunsinger, 1977). While other forms of punishment may likewise be inappropriately administered in moments of frustration, physical punishment is uniquely difficult to retract once the misapplication has taken place (Vockell, 1991). Although the utilization of corporal punishment may have some educational or behavioral management benefits according to some of its supporters, the problems associated with its improper use certainly offset its alleged benefits (Bauer, Dubanoski, Yamauchi, & Honbo, 1990).

35) There is evidence that indicates that corporal punishment is particularly damaging to children who are already neglected or abused (Dill & Haberman, 1995). In fact, physical punishment may not be effective with children who are already physically abused at home (Elrod, 1983).

36) There is the danger that the official sanctioning of corporal punishment could open the door to improper bodily contact with children on the part of school officials resulting in allegations of child sexual abuse (Dayton, 1994).

37) It should be questioned whether a person whose psychological balance and stability are largely unknown to parents, students, and the general public should be given the power to administer corporal punishment to school children (Smith, Polloway, & West, 1979). In fact, there is reason to believe that those who resort to the use of physical punishment are manifesting symptoms of personal instability. These adults appear to gain some form of sadistic pleasure in beating children and are, thereby, communicating to children that violence is a legitimate way of seeking to resolve tensions (Clark In Clark & Miller, 1980). Moreover, there is evidence that suggests that educators who frequently utilize or advocate the utilization of corporal punishment tend to be comparatively closed-minded or dogmatic (Parkay & Conoley, 1982). They also tend to be emotional, anxious, impulsive in nature, and rejecting of viewpoints which differ from their own (Rust & Kinnard, 1983). In addition, resorting to physical force as a means of discipline is very often

indicative of an intellectual inability to defend one's point of view in a convincing manner, of an inadequate degree of confidence in the moral veracity and rightfulness of one's viewpoints, and of an unconscious fear that one's own position does not represent the truth (Gilmartin, 1979).

38) In defense of the use of corporal punishment, Killory (1974) cites the following criteria against which the effectiveness of any punishment procedure should be judged: (1) It should result in the greatest behavior change; (2) It should demand the least effort on the part of the user; (3) It should result in behavior that is relatively permanent; and (4) It should produce minimal undesirable side-effects. However, none of these criteria are met when one considers the evidence available on the administration of physical punishment within the schools (Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977).

39) Many of the features of effective corporal punishment are not achievable or acceptable within the typical classroom setting. For instance, physical punishment is most successful when administered (1) with complete surprise and, therefore, without prior discussion or explanation, (2) immediately following an occurrence of misbehavior, and (3) following each and every occurrence of misbehavior. In general, the severity of such punishment needs to be high in order for it to be effective (Orentlicher, 1992). Regarding the latter point, in order for corporal punishment to be effective in stopping children's misbehavior the results would often result in their hospitalization (Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977). Furthermore, to be effective such punishment must be applied immediately and consistently. Yet within the normal classroom setting, behavior that one wishes to eliminate can hardly be monitored closely enough to be punished each time it takes place. Thus the occasional use of physical punishment results in a situation where the misbehavior is only intermittently attended to. This subsequently results in a situation where instead of weakening the undesirable behavior, occasional corporal punishment may actually strengthen misbehavior that is intermittently reinforced (Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977).

40) A primary reason for the utilization of corporal punishment should be for its reductive effects, i.e., the reduction of undesirable

behavior in children (Rose, 1984). Yet physical punishment has not been proven to be particularly effective in deterring misbehavior (Borich, 1992; Davidson, 1980). In fact, the widespread use of corporal punishment should be a concern. The source of this concern is not in the administration of physical punishment per se but rather in the unsubstantiated effects resulting from its use. There is virtually no applied empirical studies that support its utilization. The administration of such a behavioral management procedure, in the absence of evidence of what its possible short-term and long-term side effects are and that it is truly effective for its primary purpose, should be cause for concern. Under such present circumstances, its use within a large number of schools should increase this concern (Rose, 1984 & 1989). Furthermore, not only is research lacking in support of the utilization of corporal punishment, but its proponents offer no evidence beyond their own personal opinion, conjecture, or folklore regarding its validity as a disciplinary measure (Block, 1994). Moreover, advocates of physical punishment must accept the burden of proof for the efficacy of such a disciplinary procedure, and a moratorium on the administration of such punishment within the schools should be put into effect until such evidence is provided (Smith, Polloway, & West, 1979).

41) Although there are varying orientations toward the efficacy and respectability of corporal punishment, even its most ardent supporters would generally recommend the use of alternative methods of discipline if effective ones, from their perspective, were currently available (Feshbach & Feshbach, 1973).

42) The abolishment of corporal punishment does not equate with the elimination of school discipline. Physical punishment can be replaced with positive forms of discipline that represent effective methods of classroom management (Dubanoski, Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983). In fact, research suggests that alternative methods of managing children's behavior are more effective than corporal punishment. Consequently, there should be no need to use physical punishment within the schools (Orentlicher, 1992). Alternatives to corporal punishment should encompass various approaches that respect the individual child and teach self-discipline while correcting inappropriate behavior (Richardson, Wilcox, & Dunne, 1994). They should also entail both proactive and reactive strategies and interventions from humanistic, behavioral, cognitive, and ecological

models of behavior management (Evans & Richardson, 1995; Richardson & Evans, 1994b). Moreover, such alternatives should be based upon ingenuity, imagination, control, motivation to goodwill, devotion to mental health, and learning principles (Langer, 1973). Teacher education programs and school districts must become more involved in demonstrating and disseminating new techniques of behavior managment through both preservice and inservice training sequences (Bauer, Dubanoski, Yamauchi, & Honbo, 1990; Smith, Polloway, & West, 1979).

43) It is not clear that corporal punishment would be justified even if it were proven to be an effective way of behavioral control. Children are entitled to be treated with dignity and respect and to learn in a school environment free of physical abuse or the threat of such abuse. When society allows the physical punishment of children that would not otherwise be permitted for an adult, it conveys a troubling message about the moral worth of children, i.e., a message that is more consistent with an anachronistic view of children as chattels rather than with the current view as human beings who are entitled to the very same rights as adults unless there is a compelling reason to treat them in a different manner (Orentlicher, 1992). In growing numbers, opponents of corporal punishment are proclaiming that such punishment is a fundamental breach of human rights and thus should be forbidden (Essex, 1989). Moreover, it is pointed out that effective disciplinary techniques within a democratic social order incorporate respect for the rights of individuals (Hyman & D'Alessandro, 1984).

44) The physical consequences of corporal punishment for a child are obvious, but not so apparent are the negative psychological effects resulting from such a disciplinary measure (Henson, 1986). The negative psychological consequences of physical punishment for children, which may be as harmful as the physical effects, include the following: experiencing nightmares; loss of self-esteem; blocking the development of emotional strength; defensiveness; emotionality; insomnia; poor self-concept; increased anxiety and fear; tension; impairment of ego functioning; stress; feelings of helplessness, humiliation and annihilation; stifled relationships with others; resistance; operant and elicited aggression; self-destructive behavior often culminating in suicidal gestures; feelings of hostility; escape; withdrawal; avoidance behavior; negative self-statements; limited

attention span and hyperactivity in school leading to deficient academic performance; counter-aggression; negative peer reactions; lack of self-direction; immaturity; self-depreciation; negativity; depression; school phobia; vulnerability to separation; delinquent aggression; lessening of self-respect; sullenness; chronic passivity; overdependence upon external control; and "educator-induced post-traumatic stress disorder" (Borich, 1992; Divoky, 1973; Dubanoski, Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983; Edwards, 1997; Elrod, 1983; Forness & Sinclair, 1984; Gilmartin, 1979; Hyman, 1978; Hyman & Lally, 1981; Johns & MacNaughton, 1990; Maurer, 1980 & 1990; McCord, 1991; Orentlicher, 1992; Psychiatric News, 1982; Slate, Perez, Waldrop, & Justen, 1991; Smith, Polloway, & West, 1979; Vockell, 1991; Welsh, 1978). Even the witnessing of corporal punishment is psychologically damaging to children (Ball, 1989).

45) For some opponents the potential for counteraggression constitutes the greatest danger in the use of physical punishment. There is evidence that corporal punishment increases the possibility of physical retaliation. The punished child may take out his/her anger by striking back not only at the source of punishment but also toward other individuals and objects within the immediate environment (Bongiovanni & Hyman, 1978; Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977). Thus the utilization of corporal punishment may result in the possibility of physical harm to both the punished child and the punisher (Burden & Byrd, 1994). Moreover, it is important to realize that some children harbor resentment and feel a need to retaliate after receiving physical punishment. This "state of war" is likely to interfere with future attempts at both discipline and instruction (Vockell, 1991).

46) Available evidence suggests that children not only become more or overly aggressive as a result of being the recipient of physical punishment (Davidson, 1980; Edwards, 1997) but that they also demonstrate more aggressive behavior as a result of merely witnessing the administration of such punishment upon others (Fairchild & Erwin, 1977).

47) The use of corporal punishment inadvertently teaches children that "might makes right," i.e., it teaches them by example that physical force, violence, aggressive behavior, or the infliction of pain is a legitimate solution of choice in any conflict or problem solving

situation or for morally correct ends (Burden & Byrd, 1994; Divoky, 1973; Gilmartin, 1979; Henson, 1986; Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977; Keeshan, 1989; Langer, 1973; Maurer, 1980; Orentlicher, 1992; Radin, 1988; Richardson & Evans, 1994b; Simmons, 1991; Straus, 1991; Tauber, 1995). However, violent and physically punitive solutions are out of place in the schools since children are already exposed to far too many hostile and aggressive models both in the media and the world at large (Dubanoski, Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983). Physical punishment is antithetical to the purposes of American education for it makes the educator a poor model by promoting force as a means to settling arguments and establishing rights (Johns & MacNaughton, 1990). Moreover, children learn that physically striking and imposing pain on another person is not only justified but is engaged in by powerful and influential role models (Smith, Polloway, & West, 1979). In addition, the practice of corporal punishment is in conflict with the federal goal of violence-free schools as stated in Goals 2000 (Dayton, 1994).

48) The use of corporal punishment should be banned because it hinders all five major developmental stages of school-aged children postulated by Erikson, i.e., basic trust, autonomy, initiative, industry, and identity. For instance, when physical punishment is administered to a child basic trust is replaced by hostility, fear, and resentment while autonomy is retarded by both shame and doubt (Davidson, 1980).

49) The irony regarding the use of corporal punishment by parents or educators is that while their intent for such a disciplinary measure is usually to produce or increase social conformity among children within the immediate situation, in the long run physical punishment actually tends to create or increase the probability of nonconforming behavior, different forms of psychopathology, and long-lasting behavioral and psychological disorders. There has been perceived or found an association between the amount and degree of corporal punishment and the following types of personal problems: adolescent delinquency; school tardiness; school vandalism; theft of school property; school truancy; lower grades; dropping out of school; student violence; adult criminal behavior, especially violent crime inside and outside the family; sexual aberrations and maladjustment; and development of eating disorders (Bryan & Freed, 1982; Davidson, 1980; Fathman, 1995; Gilmartin, 1979; Hyman, 1978; Hyman,

Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977; Langer, 1973; Maurer, 1980 & 1990; McCord, 1991; Nash, 1963; Orentlicher, 1992; Radin, 1988; Ramella, 1973; Rorty, Yager, & Rossotto, 1995; Ryan, 1994; Straus, 1991; Welsh, 1976 & 1978). Thus reliance on physical punishment as a procedure for behavior management may lead not only to suppressing the acquisition of adaptive behaviors, but may actually contribute to the development of maladaptive behaviors instead (Smith, Polloway, & West, 1979).

50) When corporal punishment is used there is a strong tendency for the recipient to actively avoid the punishing individual or environment. Such a tendency when associated with school or school personnel has the potential of destroying the student-teacher relationship (Hyman, Bongiovanni, Friedman, & McDowell, 1977). Moreover, the use of physical punishment does not promote a caring relationship between a student and a teacher (Evans & Richardson, 1995), which is associated with more positive student responses toward school and with increased academic achievement (Burden & Byrd, 1994).

51) The use of corporal punishment may create in children emotional reactions that block desirable educational growth (Barbour, 1944), such as nervousness and psychological tension (Gilmartin, 1979). Moreover, the administration of physical punishment is counterproductive to the creation of a healthy learning environment (Evans & Richardson, 1995; Johns & MacNaughton, 1990; Tauber, 1995) and to enhancing children's academic achievement (Fathman, 1995). Data from the U.S. Department of Education show that states with high rates of corporal punishment also have lower than average test scores (Waters, 1993). Furthermore, physical punishment, in some cases, has been shown to result not only in heightened anxiety for the punished child but also for innocent classmates, which is detrimental to the learning process (Bongiovanni & Hyman, 1978). Corporal punishment often discourages not only a love for learning but also a motivation for success among children (Richardson, Wilcox, & Dunne, 1994). In addition, the mere threat of physical punishment is inhibiting to learning within the classroom (Ball, 1989) and reduces the ability to concentrate upon intellectual tasks (Maurer, 1980). It is felt that the goal of eliminating corporal punishment in schools will allow teachers to maximize their own effectiveness as educators and students' own effectiveness as learners (Dubanoski,

Inaba, & Gerkewicz, 1983).

52) The abolition of corporal punishment can enhance teaching standards in several ways. First of all, it will benefit school discipline by stimulating and encouraging educators to look for more enlightened and ingenious methods and approaches to dealing with children's behavioral problems. Secondly, it will force out incompetent educators who presently use physical punishment as a shield for concealing their ineptitude. Finally, it will draw into teaching quality candidates who are currently repelled by a profession that is associated with such primitive disciplinary methods (Nash, 1963).

53) The effect of corporal punishment on the relationship between an educator and a student is likely to differ in degree from the effect of such punishment on the relationship between a parent and his/her child. In most homes the ties of mutual respect and love are strong enough to carry a child over the period of hatred into a period of reestablished goodwill with a parent, but these strong emotional ties are not commonly present within a classroom situation between a student and an educator. Thus the effect of physical punishment at school is likely to be worse than the effect of the same type of punishment at home (Barbour, 1944).

54) The only time corporal punishment can be used in schools without danger is when the relationship between an educator and a child has been carefully established over a long period of time, i.e., several years, and now rests upon a solid foundation of mutual respect and genuine affection. However, seldom, if ever, is such punishment administered under these conditions (Nash, 1963).

55) The use of corporal punishment should be avoided because it damages the punisher by tarnishing his/her image. The educator who resorts to the utilization of physical punishment falls from being a respected leader to a hated adversary. Concern regarding his/her image before others should alone be enough incentive to motivate any educator to avoid the use of this form of disciplinary action (Maurer, 1980). Stated in another way, no one who participates in behavior that is demeaning to others can avoid being demeaned himself/herself as a result (Hentoff, 1973).

Final Remarks

Following a comprehensive review of the professional literature, it became most readily apparent to this writer that without question the preponderance of this body of literature is preoccupied with presenting and advancing arguments against the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary procedure with children. In general, such arguments are based upon philosophical, empirical, political, logical, psychological, moral, professional opinion, legal, pedagogical, sociological, physiological (medical), and theoretical grounds. The present author is of the opinion that each of the 55 arguments previously presented is worthy of personal reflection, consideration, and further exploration by those individuals involved in the arena of public discussion regarding this recurrent issue. This writer also feels that all educators at all levels, along with the general public, should beome involved in and must properly prepare themselves for even greater and more responsible participation in such discourse. The content of this paper is seen as just one of many informational sources currently available that interested parties can hopefully benefit from in their preparation for such public discussion. As a result of such discourse and subsequent action, it is sincerely hoped that a better society will result for this nation's children to both live and maximize their potential in.

Note Bene: The author welcomes any comments or inquiries regarding the content of this document. Please direct all correspondence to:

Patrick V. Gaffney - Assistant Professor
Department of Education
St. Thomas University
16400 N.W. 32nd Avenue
Miami, Florida 33054
Office Phone Number: 305-628-6582
Fax Number: 305-628-6532

(29)

Organizations Aimed At Abolishing Corporal Punishment

End Violence Against The Next Generation, Inc.
977 Keeler Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94708
510-527-0454

National Center For The Study Of Corporal Punishment And
Alternatives In The Schools
251 Ritter Annex
Temple University
1801 N. Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19122
215-204-6091

National Coalition To Abolish Corporal Punishment In Schools
155 W. Main Street
#100-B
Columbus, OH 43215
614-221-8829

People Opposed To Paddling Of Students, Inc. (P.O.P.S.)
12651 Breyer Forest
Suite 153
Houston, TX 77077
713-493-6232

References

Baker, J.N. (1987, June 22). Paddling: Still a sore point. Newsweek, 109, 61.

Baker v. Owen, 395 F.Supp. 294 (M.D.N.C. 1975), aff'd 423 U.S. 907 (1975).

Ball, J. (1989). The national PTA's stand on corporal punishment. The Education Digest, 54(8), 23-25.

Barbour, R. (1944). What's wrong with corporal punishment. The Nation's Schools, 33(6), 25-26.

Bard, B. (1973, February). The shocking facts about corporal punishment in the schools. Parents' & Better Family Living, 48, 44-45 & 72.

Bauer, G.B., Dubanoski, R., Yamauchi, L.A., & Honbo, K.A.M. (1990). Corporal punishment and the schools. Education and Urban Society, 22(3), 285-299.

Block, N. (1994). Paddling strikes out. The American School Board Journal, 181(9), 42 & 47.

Bongiovanni, A.F., & Hyman, I. (1978). Leviton is wrong on the use of corporal punishment. Psychology in the Schools, 15(2), 290-291.

Boonin, T. (1979). The benighted status of U.S. school corporal punishment practice. Phi Delta Kappan, 60(5), 395-396.

Borich, G.D. (1992). Effective teaching methods. New York: Macmillan.

Brenton, M. (1978). A further look at corporal punishment. Today's Education, 67(4), 52-55.

Brown, W.E., & Dayne, T. (1988). Policies/practices in public school discipline. Academic Therapy, 23(3), 297-301.

Bryan, J.W., & Freed, F.W. (1982). Corporal punishment: Normative data and sociological and psychological correlates in a community college population. The Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11(2), 77-87.

Burden, P.R., & Byrd, D.M. (1994). Methods for effective teaching. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Carey, T.A. (1994). Spare the rod and spoil the child. Is this a sensible justification for the use of punishment in child rearing? Child Abuse & Neglect, 18(12), 1005-1010.

Castan, F. (1973, September). Alternatives to corporal punishment. Scholastic Teacher, 21-27.

Chase, N.F. (1975). A child is being beaten: Violence against children, an American tragedy. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Clark, K., & Miller, C. (1980, March). Should corporal punishment be abolished in the elementary school? Instructor, 89, 22.

Clarke, J., Liberman-Lascoe, R., & Hyman, I.A. (1982). Corporal punishment in school as reported in nationwide newspapers. Child & Youth Services, 4, 47-55.

Cohen, D. (1996). Law, social policy, and violence: The impact of regional cultures. The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70(5), 961-978.

Cryan, J.R. (1987). The banning of corporal punishment in child care, school and other educative settings in the United States. Childhood Education, 63(3), 146-153.

Cryan, J.R. (1995). The banning of corporal punishment. Dimensions of Early Childhood, 23(3), 36-37.

Cryan, J.R., & Smith, J.C. (1981). The hick'ry stick: It's time to change the tune. Phi Delta Kappan, 62(6), 433-435.

Davidson, D.V. (1980). Corporal punishment: Legalized battery. The Educational Forum, 45(1), 95-105.

Dayton, J. (1994). Corporal punishment in public schools: The legal and political battle continues. West's Education Law Reporter, 3(3), 448-459.

Deley, W.W. (1988). Physical punishment of children: Sweden and the U.S.A. The Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 19(3), 419-431.

Diamantes, T. (1992). Alternatives to corporal punishment. The Clearing House, 65(4), 233-235.

Diamantes, T. (1994). Student teachers and the corporal punishment debate. Paper presented at the Annual Mid-South Educational Research Association Conference, Little Rock, AR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 379 213)

Dill, V.S., & Haberman, M. (1995). Building a gentler school. Educational Leadership, 52(5), 69-71.

Divoky, D. (1973). Corporal punishment in U.S. schools. Learning, 1, 22-27.

Dubanoski, R.A., Inaba, M., & Gerkewicz, K. (1983). Corporal punishment in schools: Myths, problems and alternatives. Child Abuse & Neglect, 7, 271-278.

Edwards, C.H. (1997). Classroom discipline & management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ellison, C.G., & Sherkat, D.E. (1993). Conservative Protestantism and support for corporal punishment. American Sociological Review, 58(1), 131-144.

Elrod, W. (1983). Discipline and corporal punishment in Indiana public secondary schools. Contemporary Education, 54(2), 141-144.

Englander, M.E. (1978). The Court's corporal punishment mandate to parents, local authorities, and the profession. Phi Delta Kappan, 59(8), 529-532.

Essex, N.L. (1989). Corporal punishment: Ten costly mistakes and how to avoid them. Principal, 68(5), 42-44.

Evans, E.D., & Richardson, R.C. (1995). Corporal punishment: What teachers should know. Teaching Exceptional Children, 27(2), 33-36.

Fairchild, L., & Erwin, W.M. (1977). Physical punishment by parent figures as a model of aggressive behavior in children. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 130, 279-284.

Farley, A.C., Kreutter, K.J., Russell, R.R., Blackwell, S., Finkelstein, H., & Hyman, I.A. (1978). The effects of eliminating corporal punishment in schools: A preliminary survey. Inequality in Education, 23, 57-60.

Fathman, R.E. (Ed.). (1995). Corporal punishment fact sheet. Columbus, OH: National Coalition to Abolish Corporal Punishment in Schools.

Feshbach, S., & Feshbach, N.D. (1973). Alternatives to corporal punishment: Implications for training and controls. The Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 2(3), 46-49.

Florida School Laws. (1995). Tallahassee, FL: State of Florida Department of Education.

Flygare, T.J. (1978). The Supreme Court approves corporal punishment. Phi Delta Kappan, 59(5), 347-348.

Flynn, C.P. (1994). Regional differences in attitudes toward corporal punishment. The Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56(2), 314-324.

Forness, S.R., & Sinclair, E. (1984). Avoiding corporal punishment in school: Issues for school counselors. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 18(4), 268-276.

Francis, S.N., & Hirschberger, E.J. (1973). Corporal punishment in school: 1973. Educational Leadership, 30(7), 591-595.

Gaffney, P.V. (1991). Knowledge of and attitudes toward the legal rights of public school students on the part of undergraduate education students at the University of Mississippi (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52(5), 1713A-1714A.

Gilmartin, B.G. (1979). The case against spanking. Human Behavior, 8, 18-23.

Glackman, T., Martin, R., Hyman, I., McDowell, E., Berv, V., & Spino, P. (1978). Corporal punishment, school suspension, and the civil rights of students: An analysis of Office for Civil Rights school surveys. Inequality in Education, 23, 61-65.

Gordon, W.M. (1995). The search for reasonableness: Legal issues in student discipline. School Business Affairs, 61(7), 18-21.

Grasmick, H.G., Morgan, C.S., & Kennedy, M.B. (1992). Support for corporal punishment in the schools: A comparison of the effects of socioeconomic status and religion. Social Science Quarterly, 73(1), 177-187.

Harp, L., & Miller, L. (1995, September 6). States turn up heat in debate over paddlings. Education Week, pp. 1 & 24.

Henson, K.T. (1986). Corporal punishment: Ten popular myths. The High School Journal, 68(2), 107-109.

Hentoff, N. (1973). A parent-teacher's view of corporal punishment. Today's Education, 62(5), 18-21 & 56.

Hoffman, M.L., & Saltzstein, H.D. (1967). Parent discipline and the child's moral development. The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5(1), 45-57.

Hyman, I.A. (1978). A social science review of evidence cited in litigation on corporal punishment in the schools. The Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 7(3), 195-199.

Hyman, I.A., Bongiovanni, A., Friedman, R.H., & McDowell, E. (1977). Paddling, punishing and force: Where do we go from here? Children Today, 6(5), 17-23.

Hyman, I.A., Clarke, J., & Erdlen, R.J. (1987). Analysis of physical abuse in American schools. Aggressive Behavior, 13(1), 1-7.

Hyman, I.A., & D'Alessandro, J. (1984). Good, old-fashioned discipline: The politics of punitiveness. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(1), 39-45.

Hyman, I.A., & Lally, D.M. (1981). Corporal punishment in American education: A historical and contemporary dilemma. Educational Comment, 10, 8-15.

Hyman, R.T. (1993). Corporal punishment: Just what is it and what should we do about it? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, Philadelphia, PA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 376 563)

Ingraham v. Wright, 430 U.S. 651 (1977).

Johns, F.A., & MacNaughton, R.H. (1990). Spare the rod: A continuing controversy. The Clearing House, 63(9), 388-392.

Johnson, J.A., Dupuis, V.L., Musial, D., & Hall, G.E. (1994). Introduction to the foundations of American education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Keeshan, B. (1989). Banning corporal punishment in the classroom. The Education Digest, 54(8), 19-22.

Kennedy, J.H. (1995). Teachers, student teachers, paraprofessionals, and young adults' judgments about the acceptable use of corporal punishment in the rural south. Education and Treatment of Children, 18(1), 53-64.

Kessler, G. (1985). Spanking in school: Deterrent or barbarism? Childhood Education, 61(3), 175-176.

Killory, J.F. (1974). In defense of corporal punishment. Psychological Reports, 35(1), 575-581.

Kinnard, K.Q., & Rust, J.O. (1981). Corporal punishment in Tennessee schools. Tennessee Education, 11(2), 11-17.

Langer, M.F. (1973, January). New year's resolution: No more corporal punishment. The Teacher, 90, 12 & 19-21.

Many states still condone corporal punishment in schools; more creative discipline urged. (1982, August). Psychiatric News, p. 21.

Maurer, A. (1980). Corporal punishment in the school setting: "What are we going to do with some of these kids?" Educational Perspectives, 19, 20-23.

Maurer, A. (1990). Corporal punishment in the public schools. The Humanistic Psychologist, 19(1), 30-47.

McCann, E. (1978). Children's perceptions of corporal punishment. Educational Studies, 4(2), 167-172.

McCord, J. (1991). Questioning the value of punishment. Social Problems, 38(2), 167-179.

Medway, F.J., & Smircic, J.M. (1992). Willingness to use corporal punishment among school administrators in South Carolina. Psychological Reports, 71(1), 65-66.

Mercurio, J.A. (1972). Caning: Educational ritual. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 10(1), 49-53.

Merlis, G. (1975, November 1). The updated hickory stick. The Nation, 221, 425-427.

Nash, P. (1963). Corporal punishment in an age of violence. Educational Theory, 13(4), 295-308.

Orentlicher, D. (1992). Corporal punishment in the schools. JAMA, 267(23), 3205-3208.

Pallas, A. (1973). Corporal punishment: Ancient practice in modern times. The Clearing House, 47(5), 312-315.

Parkay, F.W., & Conoley, C. (1982). Characteristics of educators who advocate corporal punishment: A brief report. The Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 21(1), 33-36.

Payne, M.A. (1989). Use and abuse of corporal punishment: A Caribbean view. Child Abuse & Neglect, 13(3), 389-401.

Pross, M.N. (1988, October). Discipline dilemma: To paddle or not to paddle. Learning, 17, 42-49.

Radin, N. (1988). Alternatives to suspension and corporal punishment. Urban Education, 22(4), 476-495.

Raichle, D.R. (1977/1978). School discipline and corporal punishment: An American retrospect. Interchange, 8(1-2), 71-83.

Ramella, R. (1973, June). The anatomy of discipline: Should punishment be corporal? The PTA Magazine, 67, 24-27.

Rancifer, J.L. (1995). The real cutting edge in education: Changing misbehaving students in the classroom and school. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Detroit, MI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 382 576)

Rich, J.M. (1989). The use of corporal punishment. The Clearing House, 63(4), 149-152.

Richardson, R.C., & Evans, E. (1994a). Paddling in Louisiana's public schools. The Louisiana Education Research Journal, 19(2), 97-106.

Richardson, R.C., & Evans, E.T. (1994b). Changing community policies: Your role in eliminating corporal punishment in schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Coalition to Abolish Corporal Punishment in Schools, Raleigh, NC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 383 100)

Richardson, R.C., Wilcox, D.J., & Dunne, J. (1994). Corporal punishment in schools: Initial progress in the Bible belt. The Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 32(4), 173-182.

Rorty, M., Yager, J., & Rossotto, E. (1995). Aspects of childhood physical punishment and family environment correlates in bulimia nervosa. Child Abuse & Neglect, 19(6), 659-667.

Rose, T.L. (1981). The corporal punishment cycle: A behavioral analysis of the maintenance of corporal punishment in the schools. Education and Treatment of Children, 4(2), 157-169.

Rose, T.L. (1983). A survey of corporal punishment of mildly handicapped students. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 3(4), 9-19.

Rose, T.L. (1984). Current uses of corporal punishment in American public schools. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(3), 427-441.

Rose, T.L. (1989). Corporal punishment with mildly handicapped students: Five years later. Remedial and Special Education, 10(1), 43-52.

Rust, J.O., & Kinnard, K.Q. (1983). Personality characteristics of the users of corporal punishment in the schools. The Journal of School Psychology, 21(2), 91-98.

Ryan, F.J. (1994). From rod to reason: Historical perspectives on corporal punishment in the public school, 1642-1994. Educational Horizons, 72(2), 70-77.

Sendor, B. (1987). Kids gain new protection from corporal punishment. The American School Board Journal, 174(11), 32 & 53.

Shaw, S.R., & Braden, J.P. (1990). Race and gender bias in the administration of corporal punishment. School Psychology Review, 19(3), 378-383.

Simmons, B.J. (1991). Ban the hickory stick. Childhood Education, 68(2), 69-70.

Simpson, M. (1988, February). Let the paddler beware. NEA Today, 27, 5.

Slate, J.R., Perez, E., Waldrop, P.B., & Justen, J.E. (1991). Corporal punishment: Used in a discriminatory manner? The Clearing House, 64(6), 362-364.

Smith, J.D., Polloway, E.A., & West, G.K. (1979). Corporal punishment and its implications for exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 45(4), 264-268.

Spring, J. (1994). American education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Straus, M.A. (1971). Some social antecedents of physical punishment: A linkeage theory interpretation. The Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33(4), 658-663.

Straus, M.A. (1991). Discipline and deviance: Physical punishment of children and violence and other crime in adulthood. Social Problems, 38(2), 133-152.

Straus, M.A. (1994). Ten myths about spanking children. Durham, NH: The University of New Hampshire, Family Research Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 377 989)

Tauber, R.T. (1995). Classroom management: Theory and practice. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Van Dyke, H.T. (1984). Corporal punishment in our schools. The Clearing House, 57(7), 296-299.

Viadero, D. (1988, June 22). Corporal-punishment foes gain victories, see 'Best Year Ever.' Education Week, pp. 1 & 38-39.

Vockell, E.L. (1991). Corporal punishment: The pros and cons. The Clearing House, 64(4), 278-283.

Waters, R. (1993, October 12). "Mom, the teacher hit me." The Family Circle Magazine, 150-151 & 192-196.

Welsh, R.S. (1976). Violence, permissiveness and the overpunished child. The Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 1, 68-71.

Welsh, R.S. (1978). Delinquency, corporal punishment, and the schools. Crime & Delinquency, 24(3), 336-354.

Wiehe, V.R. (1990). Religious influence on parental attitudes toward the use of corporal punishment. The Journal of Family Violence, 5(2), 173-186.

Wilson, F.C. (1982). A look at corporal punishment and some implications of its use. Child Abuse & Neglect, 6, 155-164.

Wise, J.H. (1979). The carrot not the stick: Comparing the use of reward to corporal punishment in promoting discipline, learning, and human relationships in the classroom. In I.A. Hyman, & J.H. Wise (Eds.), Corporal punishment in American education: Readings in history, practice, and alternatives. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. (pp. 373-383)

Zigler, E., & Hunsinger, S. (1977). Supreme Court on spanking: Upholding discipline or abuse? Young Children, 32(6), 14-15.

Zussman, J.U. (1978). Relationship of demographic factors to parental discipline techniques. Developmental Psychology, 14(6), 685-686.